

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
SR-520/TRANS-LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OVERLAKE HOSPITAL CONFERENCE CENTER, WA
JUNE 12, 2002 — 1:00 – 4:00 P.M.

INTRODUCTION, WELCOME, AND AGENDA REVIEW

Pat Serie, EnviroIssues, opened the meeting and recognized Senator Jim Horn and Representative Ed Murray from Washington state legislature. Pat noted that Deputy Mayor, Tim Ceis, Grace Crunican Seattle Transportation Director, Councilmember Richard Conlin and Heidi Wills, are now representing the City of Seattle, with Anne Fiske Zuniga as alternate. Pat noted the agenda items for this meeting, starting with a public comment period, definition of project alternatives, state and regional funding status, follow-up on items from the January 30 Executive Committee meeting, and next steps in the process. There were no agenda changes.

COMMUNITY DESIGN FEEDBACK PROJECT UPDATE

Les Rubstello, WSDOT- Urban Corridors Office (UCO), explained the extensive public outreach done in the past months for the Trans-Lake Washington project. He mentioned that the project has met with various jurisdictions and community groups, along with holding community design workshops. There have been two community design workshops for the Montlake community, one for the Eastlake/Roanoke Park/Portage Bay/North Capitol Hill community, and another for the Points communities.

Les highlighted common themes in community input that the project has received. There have been suggestions for moving ramps and lids to different locations. Many community members recommended investing more in Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and exploring different TDM methodologies. The Montlake community has asked the project to find alternatives without a second Montlake Cut crossing. The Points communities would like larger lids. Flyer stop discussions are ongoing. The project plans on meeting with other communities to broaden the outreach, discuss project alternatives and gather input. Follow-up meetings are also being scheduled.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jonathan Dubman, Montlake Community Club and new Advisory Committee member, stated that given scarce resources and extensive, region-wide transportation needs, the project should assure that the 4-lane alternative is given full and fair consideration. The environmental review should take into account the significant capacity increase and reliability standards. Congestion pricing and mode/price shift should be studied for all the alternatives. The Trans-Lake

Washington project should coordinate environmental work with the Link Light Rail project, especially at the Montlake Cut. He also suggested that the project should pursue a hybrid bored transit tunnel idea.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Les Rubstello, WSDOT- UCO, introduced John Shadoff, WSDOT, who has been conducting the transportation demand management (TDM) work. John Shadoff and the TDM team have spent the last six months expanding the TDM plan, coordinating with the I-405 project. He noted the TDM opportunities throughout the region and that work is being done to develop a shared regional TDM strategy. The TDM program would vary according to the alternative chosen, with more TDM funding for the 4 and 6-lane options and less for the 8-lane option (due to the added general purpose capacity).

The 4-lane alternative would have the most extensive outreach and funding to encourage transit ridership. TDM outreach typically has not been done at the scale that is being proposed for the Trans-Lake Washington project. Many of the benefits are built up in Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) 2030 model. They are recommending an umbrella organization to oversee the TDM program.

John noted that Washington is a national leader with implementing successful TDM programs. The University of Washington U-Pass program has been highly successful. Commute trip reduction has been in place for 10 years and has achieved a 1% reduction of daily trips in this region. Washington Mutual has increased employee telecommuting and the University Village employees all have a bus pass. Washington State Ferries has a widely used vanpool program.

John stated that the SR-520 corridor has high percentages of commuting trips. The project team identified seven areas that make up the majority of origins and destinations – downtown Seattle, Kirkland/Totem Lake, Redmond/Overlake, downtown and northwest Bellevue, northwest Seattle, University District, and east central Seattle. The Trans-Lake TDM program is based on interlocal agreements to reduce SOV trips, first recommended in the initial Trans-Lake Washington Study. The proposal is patterned after BROTS, and is supported by an FTA grant. John discussed that the key to accountability is an oversight committee that has the ability to adjust the TDM program as it progresses, ensuring that successful TDM programs are continued and increased. The TDM program goals are to reduce the rate of growth of Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the Corridor Overall and increase person throughput on the Bridge.

John explained that the TDM program would work by having individual corridors determine their specific needs and focus. The Trans-Lake Washington and I-405 project TDM funding would overlap, allowing some of the SR-520 money to be redistributed. The TDM program will be refined in the EIS process and formalized in a corridor level agreement.

The following questions and points were brought up at this time:

- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle, asked whether the Trans-Lake Washington project committees have the authority to shift funds in the TDM program to produce the most cost effective solution. He asked if 20-year costs are being done in current dollars. Richard would like opportunities for creative programs and to stimulate a free market for TDM. He noted that land use as TDM is a great concept but that with the small amount of money allocated for this program (\$8 million) it will not go very far. He is in support of increasing the TDM as land use funds.
- Aubrey Davis, Washington State Transportation Commission, emphasized the need for a new funding source for TDM. He suggested that the project look into regional funding capabilities for operational funds while also pursuing capital funds.
- Tim Ceis, City of Seattle, asked to understand how transit factors into the TDM program. He noted that SR-520 is a better transit corridor in terms of gross transit capacity. The King County Metro 6-year plan does not envision new bus service. The capital program is directly impacted by the current sales tax. He wondered how ongoing transit service can be paid for. Aubrey Davis mentioned that the project is struggling with funding shortfalls and that they will integrate planning capabilities to identify where funding is falling short.
- Jim Horn, Washington State Senate, discussed how there is opposition in the legislature to TDM money being raised without increasing general purpose capacity in the corridor.
- Dan Becker, Mayor of Medina, asked about the Referendum 51 funds. He noted that there should be incentives provided for people living closer to their place of employment. John Shadoff, WSDOT, discussed a program at Boeing that provides incentives for workers to switch jobs to be closer to their place of residence. For the Trans-Lake Washington project this type of incentive program would be found in the 'work choices' category.
- Dave Asher, City of Kirkland, asked how TDM can be most effective and whether there are ways for re-allocating funds. He noted that transit demand is directly related to the number of lanes on the freeway. He questioned how the TDM program is measured for effectiveness and if there are baseline comparisons. He wondered how the TDM analysis varies for the different alternatives, why certain TDM strategies were chosen, and where the numbers originated. John Shadoff responded that there are ways for measuring TDM effectiveness although there are challenges with this type of comparison. Les Rubstello pointed out that pricing is not a part of the TDM study. The PSRC model illustrates that the number of people using transit varies. Each of the three alternatives has a different transit plan.
- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle, pointed out that it is not clear why particular TDM methodologies/program elements were chosen in terms of cost effectiveness. He questioned the basis of funding amounts, how TDM program elements were chosen, and whether there was analysis available on the effects of increasing funds.

- Aubrey Davis asked how the use of vanpools could be maximized.
- Rosemary Ives, Mayor of Redmond, noted that SR-520 and I-405 function differently and that the I-405 project should not be a template for the SR-520 corridor. The Trans-Lake Washington project could have a more aggressive TDM program. John Shadoff pointed out that there is a different level of focus for I-405 and the SR-520 corridors and that vanpooling funding/incentives were increased for the SR-520 corridor.

INTERCHANGE DEFINITIONS

Jeff Peacock, Parametrix, described the current interchange designs for the Trans-Lake Washington project. The project team has been working hard on refining interchange locations and options, in conjunction with local jurisdictions.

I-5 and Montlake Interchanges

Jeff stated that the I-5 interchange has not had any substantive changes since the group last met. The HOV lanes tie into I-5 express lanes southbound on the right side versus the left side. The project has plans that reverse the I-5 southbound off ramp (on the left side). There could be two homes impacted on the eastern corner.

Jeff described that the project team has developed three interchange options for the Montlake area, two for the 6-lane alternative and one for the 8-lane alternative. The basic interchange layout remains unchanged. There is a braided ramp to the University District with a dedicated HOV lane to Montlake Boulevard on the ramp structure. The 6-lane options for Montlake Boulevard either widen the existing Montlake Bridge or build a parallel bridge to the east or west of the historical bridge. The 'ramps to nowhere' are removed. The transit flyer stop has been moved to the middle of the facility. The engineering work for the 8-lane alternative provides a second Montlake crossing with a tunnel under the Montlake Cut. Several of the options show that the traffic volumes dropping significantly on Montlake Boulevard.

For this portion of the discussion, the following questions and points were discussed:

- Richard Conlin asked if I-5 HOV access is one-way in the morning hours and what the effects are on opposing traffic.
- Dave Asher asked whether HOV traffic coming from the east would have to move across the general purpose lanes to exit.
- Jim Horn asked the project team if they have considered eliminating the Montlake interchange. He asked what the Montlake community recommends. Jeff Peacock responded that the project is working with the City of Seattle and the Montlake community and that there was some resistance to a second crossing at the Montlake Cut.

- Fred McConkey, Mayor of Hunts Point, requested a cost comparison for the tunnel and building a flyover at Montlake. Jeff Peacock discussed how both the tunnel and flyover are very expensive though the second Montlake crossing on a bridge is half of the cost of the tunnel option. The tunnel would require mechanical ventilation.

East of Lake Washington

Jeff Peacock stated that the interchange drawings for the area east of Lake Washington have not changed significantly since the Executive Committee last met. There has been work done with providing a smooth ramp to Bellevue Way and there will be continued work with a flyer stop at Evergreen Point Road. All the current movements at the I-405 interchange will be carried forward in project alternatives. For the 8-lane alternative a ramp has been provided to the Redmond Town Center. There will be more work done with providing HOV access to the SR 202 connection.

- Rosemary Ives, Mayor of Redmond, clarified that the City of Redmond did not ask for the ramp to Redmond Town Center.
- Dave Asher, City of Kirkland, asked if the I-405 /SR-520 interchange provides direct HOV access in all directions. Jeff Peacock responded that three out of four of the movements have direct HOV access.
- Fred McConkey, Mayor of Hunts Point, questioned whether the Evergreen Point Road flyer stop would be feasible and if this would need to be placed on a bridge. He asked about the parking lot plans for flyer stops. Dan Becker stated that there has not yet been a formal discussion on flyer stops.

Lidding Options

Jeff Peacock explained the project lidding options. He pointed out that the lidding options are integral to the project and sized to not require ventilation (e.g., 300-500 feet), as discussed at the previous Trans-Lake Washington project Executive Committee meeting (January 30, 2002).

Noise Evaluation

Jeff went over the current pre-EIS noise case study work. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) criteria requires that mitigation be done for receivers approaching or exceeding 67 dBA (WSDOT interpretation is anything above 66 dBA), that noise be measured at five feet off the ground, and that there are cost effectiveness considerations. He noted that City of Seattle Councilmember Richard Conlin had requested that the project consider using other criteria, specifically a 65 dBA, annual Ldn threshold (measured at 5, 15, and 25 feet above ground) and that differences in mitigation requirements be identified.

Jeff described the noise analysis that has been done. This includes summarizing a variety of noise criteria methodologies used by FHWA, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The 25 feet and 65 dBA/Ldn are FAA criteria. The project

team has met with N.O.I.S.E. several times and tried to reach agreement that a 15-foot height is more realistic than a 25-foot measurement (coincides with second story outdoor use receiver). They have monitored existing noise levels throughout the SR-520 corridor and modeled future noise conditions in case studies at 84th, I-5/SR-520 interchange, and Montlake Boulevard.

He mentioned that case studies have included 500-foot lids and assumed noise walls in other locations, varying from 12 to 16 feet. The project team has found that the difference between FHWA (5 feet, 15 feet, and 65 Ldn) is related to the 15-foot receivers. The project team has found that noise wall heights can easily be adjusted (+/- 2-4 feet in additional height) to bring receivers under threshold criteria and lids do not need to be extended to achieve noise reductions that can be accomplished with noise walls. Jeff noted that the average noise level decrease with noise walls would be 10 dBA, which is a dramatically noticeable noise level drop. The project team has found that there are limited locations that have had 15-foot high outdoor uses.

Jeff went over the noise analysis conclusions and recommendations. The project plans on continuing the use of FHWA criteria, including consideration for second-story outdoor uses (15 feet receivers), and that they will continue work with +/- 500 foot lids and noise walls in all other locations.

During the noise discussion, the following points and questions were noted:

- Ted Lane, representing N.O.I.S.E., pointed out there was no consensus from the N.O.I.S.E. group with using 15 feet versus 25 feet for noise measurement.
- Dan Becker mentioned his concerns over SR-520 noise receiver height standards for Medina. He noted that there are some homes in Medina that are 36 feet high. Dan asked for clarification on lidding options. He noted that in February 2001 there were lidding options presented at community design workshops. Medina residents have questioned why these lidding options have been pulled out of project consideration. Many Medina residents were pleased with some of the previous lidding concepts that were a little over 500 feet in length. Dan would like clarification on who pulled the lidding options and how the previous designs are specifically being addressed. Jeff Peacock clarified that those drawings represented a full range of lidding options. Aubrey Davis pointed out that the Executive Committee basically agreed to remove lids longer than 500 feet from further consideration. Dan responded that the Executive Committee does not have to live with the resulting ideas that they vote on. He asked what is the minimum noise reduction requirement.
- Fred McConkey requested 16-foot noise walls near the Town of Hunts Point residences.
- Heidi Wills, City of Seattle Councilmember, asked whether the project team has looked at materials that absorb noise.
- Ed Murray, Washington State House of Representatives, requested time to confer with City of Seattle representatives before agreeing on project recommendations.

- George Martin, City of Clyde Hill, questioned why the lidding discussions and decisions have to be done now. Jeff Peacock explained that the project team would like to maintain the schedule and that the lidding options are integral to the design. Aubrey Davis stated that this Executive Committee has agreed to progress through this project according to the schedule. George responded that the noise levels in Clyde Hill will not be mitigated for residents that live up the hill with the current project plans.
- Dan Becker stated that his constituents do not support this project if they will only receive noise walls. He discussed how residents will have to deal with ten years of construction impacts. He said that the project will not move forward as quickly as scheduled and that the project will have to deal with the Medina community down the line for cost analysis. George Martin noted that he is not advocating longer lids but is suggesting postponing the lidding decision. George would like to work with the project in more detail to refine the flyer stop design. Les Rubstello pointed out that 500-foot lid dimension is a rough estimate and that the longest length which does not require ventilation has not been precisely identified yet. Ed Murray also suggested waiting on the lid decision. Noting the group's sentiments, the lid decision was deferred until the July Executive Committee meeting.
- Fred McConkey noted the lack of direct access from Bellevue Way to Hunts Point in the project plans and he would like the project to consider providing that access.
- Dan Becker requested looking at other flyer stop locations. He would like another discussion with the project team concerning the flyer stop location. Les Rubstello pointed out that they had a meeting with Medina concerning this issue and the project plans on meeting with them again. He noted that Metro has said that they require the flyer stop in the inner roadway and that they would not stop if the flyer stop was on the outside of the roadway. Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit, stated that there is a difference between flyer stops and direct access and that buses would stop only briefly for pickups. Dave Asher suggested looking at including a flyer stop at Bellevue Way.
- Jeff Peacock clarified that there will be slight widening of the I-5 footprint (second page in packet) and that he is confident this can be accomplished without displacing Boylston Avenue and Lakeview Boulevard.
- Rosemary Ives suggested that funding information be shared before the Executive Committee makes any decisions.
- Aubrey Davis suggested that the Executive Committee consider deciding on the preliminary preferred alternative at the July 9 meeting. This would help guide the environmental analysis and provide a clear SR-520 alternative for regional transportation project discussions. Jim Horn noted his concerns with having accurate funding information before making this decision.
- Cynthia Sullivan, King County Councilmember, discussed her concern with providing TDM effectiveness measures (with land use) for project environmental analysis.

- Pat Serie pointed out that the Executive Committee needs to gain consensus today on whether to move forward with current engineering work (for the interchanges) and the caveat that Bellevue and Redmond interchanges will be refined further with jurisdictional input. The Executive Committee agreed to have the interchanges as defined move forward into further analysis. Final decision on lid configuration will be deferred.

UPDATED PROJECT INFORMATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT DISTRICT (RTID) PLAN

Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO, provided a state and regional transportation project funding update. She described how UCO has looked at project options and derived value for risks and opportunities on transportation corridors. UCO has provided accurate project information for decision-makers in order to establish public expectations on transportation project investments, using a systematic cost estimate validation process. This process involved working with regional and national experts to review scopes and cost estimates or identify project benefits, estimate cost ranges, and define cost/schedule risks.

Maureen stated that project summaries include multiple options without the preferred option selected, full/partial funding scenarios, a project description with benefits, schedule assumptions to adjust estimates to midpoint construction dates for inflation, project cost probability ranges at the current state of design, and major risk factors and unknowns to which cost estimates are subject. Project cost estimates are in dollar ranges rather than a single figure. Specific project risk considerations are identified and described, along with likely project construction schedules.

She noted the key findings for the Trans-Lake Washington project, which are that cost estimates for the three options remained within the ranges previously identified and that several key areas of risk were found. Identified SR-520 risk areas are: the cut-and-cover tunnel under the Montlake Cut, SR-520/I-405 interchange restructuring, construction in environmentally sensitive areas, and vulnerability of floating and fixed bridges to catastrophic events. The Trans-Lake Washington project (Seattle to Redmond) full funding scenarios were provided to the group. The cost estimate validation process (CEVP) results ranged from \$1.8 billion to \$7.4 billion for the 4 and 8-lane options, including inflation for the construction mid-point.

As the region faces funding shortfalls, phasing of major projects is anticipated. Maureen suggested implementation principles to help design a phase that has the highest potential for reducing risk in the corridor, provide for a continuous usable facility with added mobility, improve the existing conditions of the environmental impacts, and meet the consensus vision for the corridor. She noted that the project shared some of this information at the Executive Committee, Financing Sub-Committee. She stated that the description of the SR-520 phases are to: replace the floating bridge and approach structures from east of Montlake Boulevard to 80th Avenue; add expanded roadway shoulders and bicycle/pedestrian paths; include one 300-500 foot lidded section of the freeway; provide noise walls in this section; and provide environmental mitigation. The first phase funding would include wider pontoons. The time needed for building the floating bridge would drive the schedule.

During the funding discussion, the following input was provided:

- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle Councilmember, requested comparison information on timing for the CEVP estimates and the I-90 corridor replacement (when I-90 had sank).
- Dave Asher, City of Kirkland, asked that the Trans-Lake Washington project provide assurance that future improvements will be considered and completed. He noted SR-520's poor track record for providing improvements at a later date.
- Jim Horn, Washington State Senate, asked if the project would let a design/build contract. Maureen Sullivan responded that WSDOT headquarters might do the bridge design and that this is normally done as quickly as possible with the most expertise. The time frame allocates 3-5 years for a parallel environmental process. The earliest the Trans-Lake Washington project draft EIS will be done is spring 2003, with a record of decision completed by 2004. The cost estimating validation structure helps clearly define risks and better manage process and time.
- Aubrey Davis noted the danger of being overtaken by other projects' funding needs. He suggested that the Executive Committee identify a preliminary preferred alternative in July. He stressed the need to get this project in a credible place for decision-making and for funding considerations. He noted that the Trans-Lake Washington project is an issue for both sides of the lake, citing the SR-520 origin/destination analysis which demonstrated equal traffic numbers coming from both directions. Cynthia Sullivan agreed with Aubrey and noted that the sooner the project can make decisions, the better the chance SR-520 has of being in the regional funding package for the ballot. She recommended honing project cost estimates and a funding package in a manner that is credible for voters.
- Rob McKenna, King County Councilmember, requested information for this decision by June and agreed that the group should decide on an accelerated time frame. Dave Asher would like project costs and any other pertinent information that will be used to make a decision on July 9 prior to the July 2, Kirkland City Council meeting. Aubrey Davis noted that updated cost information is already available. Rob would like cost comparisons between alternatives provided with transit costs separated. He asked when a record of decision would be issued.
- Connie Marshall, Bellevue City Councilmember, reminded the group that mitigation was integral to the project and to maintaining the public's trust. This should remain true even in a phasing scenario.
- Fred McConkey pointed out that the 6-lane option may be carried forward over the 8-lane alternative due to the lack of funding.
- Bob Edwards, Puget Sound Regional Council, asked if part of the decision will include the preservation of HCT and BRT options.

- Rob McKenna noted that it would be important for the Executive Committee to decide on the whole SR-520 corridor. Ed Murray and Jim Horn agreed with Rob. Rob would like to further discuss the impacts from Montlake to the Mercer weave outside of the committee meeting. He would also like to have more transit information. John Okamoto, WSDOT-UCO, noted that the funding questions necessitate a phasing discussion.
- Dan Becker asked how long a published EIS is valid. Les Rubstello noted that if there are significant changes to the corridor or if construction takes longer than ten years, the EIS would have to be re-examined.
- Richard Conlin questioned how TDM would fit into project phasing. He also asked for a cost effectiveness comparison for the I-90 bridge replacement after it sank.

NEXT STEPS

There will be work done to prepare the project committees for making a decision on the Trans-Lake Washington project preliminary preferred alternative. There will be a joint Advisory and Technical Committee meeting on June 27 to provide input on making the preliminary preferred alternative decision. The next Executive Committee meeting is planned for July 9, 2002 (all day, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.). Materials were distributed responding to Richard Conlin's request to address environmental impacts, and to define the high-capacity transit definition to be moved forward. These will be discussed at a later date.

MEETING HANDOUTS

- Agenda
- Project Interchange Drawings - Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
- Noise Evaluation Presentation - Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
- Presentation on Updated Project Information for the Development of the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) Plan - Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO
- Updated Project Information for Counties Planning the Regional Transportation Improvement District/CEVP document - Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO
- Presentation on Response to Conlin Motion on Environmental Impacts to be Studied and Mitigated (EIS Methodologies) – Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill

- Richard Conlin, City of Seattle Councilmember, comment on project alternatives/environmental analysis suggestions
- SR-520 Corridor: Montlake to Bellevue Way High Capacity Transit Accommodation Scenarios – Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
- Pricing/Managed Lane Scenarios/Matrix
- Trans-Lake Washington Project Community Design Workshop Common Themes
- City of Seattle Letter

ACTION ITEMS

- Executive Committee members send an e-mail to Pat Serie, EnviroIssues (pserie@enviroissues.com) with any additional project input.
- Provide Executive Committee information for deciding on the preliminary preferred alternative for SR-520. Dave Asher would like project cost information and any other pertinent information prior to the July 9 Executive Committee meeting for the July 2, Kirkland City Council meeting.
- Rob McKenna, King County Councilmember, would like cost comparisons between alternatives provided with transit costs separated. Rob would like to further discuss the impacts from Montlake to the Mercer weave outside of the committee meeting. He would also like to have more transit information.
- Schedule follow up meetings with Points communities concerning flyer stop details.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Executive Committee Members

Present	Name	Organization
X	Asher Dave	City of Kirkland
X	Becker Dan	City of Medina
X	Berry Jeanne	Town of Yarrow Point
X	Cairns Bryan	City of Mercer Island
X	Ceis Tim	City of Seattle
X	Conlin Richard	City of Seattle
X	Crawford Jack	Sound Transit Board
X	Crunican Grace	City of Seattle
X	Davis Aubrey	Washington Transportation Commission
X	Earling Dave	Sound Transit Board
X	Edwards Bob	Puget Sound Regional Council
	Hughes Gary	Federal Highway Administration
X	Horn Jim	Washington State Senate
X	Ives Rosemarie	City of Redmond
	Jacobsen Ken	Washington State Senate
	Krochalus Rick	Federal Transit Administration
X	Marshall Connie	City of Bellevue
X	Martin George	City of Clyde Hill
X	McConkey Fred	Town of Hunts Point
X	McKenna Rob	King County Council
X	Murray Ed	WA State House of Representatives
X	Noble Phil	City of Bellevue
X	Okamoto John	WSDOT - NW Region
	Pflug Cheryl	WA State House of Representatives
X	Sullivan Cynthia	King County Council
X	Taniguchi Harold	King County Department of Transportation
X	Wills Heidi	City of Seattle

Executive Committee Alternates

Present	Name	Organization
X	Burleigh Mary-Alice	City of Kirkland
	Bowman Jennifer	Federal Transit Administration
	Carpenter Trish	Town of Hunts Point
	Conrad Richard	City of Mercer Island
	Creighton Mike	City of Bellevue
	Demitriades Paul	City of Medina
	Drais Dan	FTA
	Dye Dave	WSDOT - NW Region
	Earl Joni	Sound Transit
	Fiske-Zuniga Anne	City of Seattle
	Hague Jane	King County Council

X	Jahncke	El	City of Mercer Island
	Kargianis	George	Washington Transportation Commission
	Mathis	Dan	Federal Highway Administration
	McKenzie	Jack	Town of Hunts Point
X	Paine	Thomas	City of Redmond
	Rourke	Philip	City of Clyde Hill
	Rutledge	Steve	City of Yarrow Point
X	Sanchez	Susan	City of Seattle

Other attendees

Ethan Melone, City of Seattle
 Chris Rose, Transportation Commission
 Ann Martin, King County
 Ted Lane, N.O.I.S.E.
 Len Newstrum, Town of Yarrow Point
 Mitch Wasserman, City of Clyde Hill
 Pete Beaulieu, PSRC
 David Godfrey, City of Kirkland

Project Team

Les Rubstello, WSDOT-UCO
 Maureen Sullivan, WSDOT-UCO
 Paul Krueger, WSDOT
 Jean Mabry, WSDOT
 Barbara Gilliland, Sound Transit
 Jane Farquharson, PSTC
 Jeff Peacock, Parametrix
 Lorie Parker, CH2M Hill
 Michael Minor, Minor and Associates
 Pat Serie, EnviroIssues
 Brad Hoff, EnviroIssues
 Jennifer Cannon, EnviroIssues
 Courtney Harris, EnviroIssues

JJC

STATEMENT TO TLWP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF 06/12/02

by Theodore Lane

My name is Theodore Lane – I'm President of NOISE and act as chairperson of the Seattle neighborhoods and organizations that have endorsed the DO NO HARM statement

The statement acknowledges the need for expanded mobility in the SR-520 corridor but also identifies 9 specific impact criteria which, if exceeded, would degrade the quality of life in Seattle neighborhoods adjacent to the corridor. The following community councils/organizations have endorsed the statement:

Portage Bay/Roanoke Park Community Council

Montlake Community Council

Madison Park Community Council

Lauralhurst Community Council

Canterbury Shores Council

N.O.I.S.E.

Roanoke Park Neighborhood Beautification Project

Eastlake/North Capital Hill Business Association

Northeast District Council

The criteria contained in the DO NO HARM statement are the same as the "localized impact criteria" which Seattle City Councilman Richard Conlin moved for adoption at the last Executive Committee meeting. Rep. Edward Murray, 43rd District, and Speaker of the House Frank Chopp have also endorsed the statement and its criteria in a letter they sent to Transportation Secretary McDonald on March 8th of this year

While many of the criteria (air quality, particulate matter, water quality, etc) are addressed by NEPA and SEPA environmental standards, the issues of noise, neighborhood traffic, neighborhood connectivity, and visual impacts are not. For the noise criteria, we proposed the standard recognized by the federal EPA as the only one compatible with residential land uses – 65 LDN measured at 25 feet above surface level

We recognize that the detailed analysis needed for an Environmental Impact Statement requires detailed engineering designs that are not available at this time. We consequently have been meeting with the WSDOT/TLWP team approximately every 2-3 weeks for the past several months to identify a set of consensus assumptions that could be fed into the federal Highway Administration's Integrated Noise Model to get a "ball park" estimate of neighborhood noise impacts.

The first results of this process are in, and they indicate that the proposed SR-520 roadway design is very noisy. Fourteen locations were mutually agreed on to measure noise impacts, and every one of them experiences increased noise levels after SR-520 is expanded. Thirteen of the fourteen locations have noise above the 65 LDN criteria. After 14-foot high noise walls were assumed along the entire SR-520/I-5 corridor impacted by the proposed roadway designs, the integrated noise model results were that 6 of the 14 locations were still noisier than they are today (without noise walls) and 5 were above the 65 LDN criteria. That is a level of noise that degrades the quality of life in our neighborhoods – and it is unacceptable.

Throughout the modeling efforts of the past several months, Aubrey Davis, Chairperson of the TLWP and Les Rubstello, WSDOT's

TLWP manager, have worked collegially with us to try and get consensus estimates of the current design's likely noise impacts. We appreciate them and the work they have done. At our meeting last week they pointed out that there may be technical reasons to alter the assumptions that were used to obtain the initial model results. We all agreed that assuming away roadway design problems will not solve noise impacts, but we also all agreed that we want to use the best set of assumptions around which we can reach consensus. We are consequently now in the process of developing a second-generation set of model assumptions that will be used to produce another model run. Those results should be available before your July meeting.

However, if the new results are consistent with the integrated noise model's first generation output, the current roadway designs will be unacceptable and will have to be redesigned.

The situation is completely analogous to what happened when first-cut modeling of the original roadway design was found to degrade vehicle movements on the interstate highway system.

The roadway was redesigned. In exactly the same manner, if roadway generated noise is found to degrade the quality of life in Seattle's neighborhoods, there will have to be a redesign.

Simply put, Seattle's neighborhoods should no more be degraded by the expansion of SR-520 than the interstate highway system.

Consequently, if the next round of consensus assumptions generate output from the integrated noise model that show the existing design degrades neighborhood quality of life, we will ask you in

July to go forward with planning but not to approve the existing roadway designs for the EIS.

We feel so strongly about this, that our communities are prepared to organize a public information campaign to defeat both the statewide and regional funding referenda this fall if they contain SR-520 roadway designs that degrade the quality of life in our neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods normally have voted in favor of transportation infrastructure improvements and against Tim Eyman-type initiatives by margins of 75% to 85%. Our neighborhoods also realize that funding for noise walls along the SR-520/I-5 intersection is contained in the statewide package independently of SR-520's expansion. And we certainly recognize the need for improvements in I-405 and the Alaska Way Viaduct.

But we feel so strongly about the need to protect the quality of life in Seattle neighborhoods from being degraded by noise, neighborhood traffic, connectivity, and visual impacts that we are prepared to take the drastic action of opposing any transportation funding packages that contain roadway designs that will degrade the quality of life in our neighborhoods.

Let me finish by saying we look forward to continued work with Aubrey, Les and the entire TLWP team in the collegial manner that the past few months have witnessed. And if a redesign is needed, then lets do it and move forward. We all have the same goal, I believe – increased mobility along the SR-520 corridor. But it's not going to happen unless we do it together and do it right.

Thank you.